

resolve to improve his environment serves as an example to us all.

Mr. Horn is most notably recognized for his extended service on the Executive Board of the Harris County AFL-CIO, where he occupied the position of Secretary-Treasurer for over thirty years. During this epoch, Mr. Horn concurrently served on the Texas AFL-CIO Executive Board as a trustee for over a decade.

Mr. Horn's merit, however, cannot be constrained to his mere occupational accomplishments. In the community, Don selflessly served a myriad of underprivileged and needy individuals in a multitude of capacities. Mr. Horn's altruistic efforts ranged from his extended service on the Harris County Hospital Board to his efforts to increase electoral participation among under-represented minority groups. Mr. Horn also volunteered countless hours to the United Way, serving on its Houston Area Board for several years, as well as the local chapter of the Boy Scouts of America. Today, Mr. Horn remains an active member of the community, serving on the City of Houston's Ethics Committee.

I sincerely commend, and thank, Mr. Don Horn on behalf of the city of Houston and its people for his accomplishments, his dedication, and for his efforts to improve his community for posterity.

HONORING BOB VOGEL

HON. JON D. FOX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1998

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute an outstanding citizen of Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District, Bob Vogel, on his selection as a member of the Abington Senior High School Hall of Fame.

Following his graduation in 1962, Bob went on to Princeton and then Yale Law School, following which he has had a distinguished career in business and law. He is currently Vice President and General Counsel of Rohm and Haas Company, whose world headquarters for research is in Spring House, Montgomery County.

Bob was nominated for this honor by his long-time friend, and mine, Ken Davis of Gladwyne, Montgomery County. Ken and Bob went through the Abington Township school system together, following which Ken served with distinction as Administrative Assistant to the late U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania, Hugh Scott. Ken then served as Director of Government Relations for Rohm and Haas Company. He now heads his own government relations consulting firm in Ardmore, Montgomery County, and is President of the Lower Merion Township Board of Commissioners.

I extend my heartiest congratulations to Bob Vogel on this memorable achievement.

PATIENT PROTECTION ACT OF 1998

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1998

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule.

Yesterday, I appeared before the Rules Committee. I urged the Committee to make in order an amendment I proposed to offer to H.R. 4250. My amendment would authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to reimburse veterans enrolled in the veterans health care system for the cost of emergency care or services received in non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities. My amendment is similar to H.R. 3702, the Veterans' Access to Emergency Health Care Act, which I introduced earlier this year.

Under the Evans amendment, veterans enrolled in the VA health care system would be reimbursed for the cost of emergency care they receive from a non-VA facility when there is a "serious threat to life or the health of a veteran."

The legislation we are considering today attempts to write into law certain basic health care protections, including emergency care protections, for millions of Americans not enrolled in the VA health care system. My amendment, which was blocked by the Rules Committee, would have afforded similar protections for the millions of American veterans who receive their health care from the VA.

Yesterday's action by the Rules Committee is a disservice to American veterans, and comes on the heels of another successful—but misguided—Republican effort to strip away compensation benefits from veterans who became addicted to tobacco while in the military. In the apparent view of the Republican leadership, veterans should have known better than to become addicted to nicotine while in the service, despite the obvious role played by our government and the tobacco companies to facilitate smoking by service members.

As yesterday's Rules Committee action suggests, veterans apparently should also have known better than to get sick and require emergency medical care outside a VA hospital.

This Congress has no conscience when it comes to issues of significance to our American veterans. Without my amendment, low-income, or service-connected disabled veterans who rely on VA for their health care needs would be provided no basic protections for emergency medical care. It's just not right, and it's a slap in the face to the men and women who have risked their lives in defense of our nation and the values we hold so dear.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for our veterans and vote against this rule.

FOREIGN AID

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1998

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have printed in the RECORD statements by high school students from my home state of Vermont, who were speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people today. I am asking that you please insert these statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as I believe that the views of these young people will benefit my colleagues.

STATEMENT BY ANGELA DEBLASIO AND LYNNE CLOUGH REGARDING FOREIGN AID

ANGELA DEBLASIO. Foreign aid is an essential part of the United States' annual bud-

et. This aid to less fortunate nations helps to alleviate famine and the effects of disasters. It promotes agricultural and industrial production. It also provides U.S. know-how for basic health, education and housing needs, while rewarding governments for embracing American ideals and interests.

Foreign aid is not just money. The United States aid program consists of development, economic, military and food assistance. Development assistance provides training and advice in all areas. Economic support contributes to the political stability and economic strength. Military aid provides grants and credits for the purchase of weapons, along with training and advice for the forces. Food aid is free or reduced-price agricultural products.

One of the great historical successes of American foreign aid was the Marshall Plan.

LYNNE CLOUGH. World War II left many scars in Western Europe and the United States. Secretary of State George Marshall proposed a plan that would not only help Western Europe overcome poverty and resist temptations of communism, but help Americans keep their jobs and offer more opportunities.

This plan became known as the Marshall Plan. We sent over tons of goods and money to Western Europe. Then, in turn, Western Europe bought our products, which gave Americans jobs. Giving U.S. aid prevented Western Europe from falling under the influence of communism and it gave us protection from the Soviet Union.

Aid to foreign countries has expanded over the past few years.

ANGELA DEBLASIO. For the past 37 years, Peace Corps volunteers have worked together with the people of Africa and other nations around the world. Today, Peace Corps volunteers contribute to grassroots development projects in education, business, the environment and health. They establish forest conservation plans and find alternatives to wood as a source of food.

Volunteers work to involve people in protecting endangered wildlife species and recycling projects. Peace Corps volunteers help individuals in developing nations to learn the skills necessary to help themselves.

The best example of how the United States gains from foreign aid is the country of Russia. The U.S. is currently giving aid to the Russians. The American taxpayers are definitely getting their money's worth. They are helping to bring banking experts, legal experts, business experts, and political scientists to the nation of Russia and create a free democratic society based on free enterprise. Also, American tax dollars are paying to help the nations of the former Soviet Union safely dismantle nuclear weapons once pointed at the United States. American aid is also helping to ensure that the nuclear materials do not fall into the hands of terrorists during these potentially dangerous times.

LYNNE CLOUGH. "Why spend our money on foreign aid?" That is a question many of us ask. As you just heard, foreign aid helps America prosper. Foreign aid is only one percent of our annual budget and is a very good investment. It provides security by aiding our allies and sets up good trading partners. Giving aid is also a way to deal with problems when they are small, and perhaps prevent future conflict.

STATEMENT BY NATALIE ROSS REGARDING STUDENT DRINKING AND DRIVING

NATALIE ROSS. Good afternoon. I will have to be quite honest with you: Many of the issues that I was going to speak about today have already been brought up with the student drinking and driving.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS. That doesn't make them less important for you to bring them up.

NATALIE ROSS. Recently, as you can tell by today, we had many people who brought up many concerns about how advertisers influence us, and many different things—we were reminded of the tragedy up in Newport, which, unfortunately, claimed two of my very close friends.

I feel there is a message that we're sending to our youth that is not totally appropriate. It has been engraved in our brains for the longest time not to drink and drive, but I think that message is totally appropriate for adults who are of age, because they have the right to drink. But I think we are only fighting the battle halfway when we tell students not to drink and drive; I feel the message should be not to drink at all.

Many times students say, it is okay, you know, somebody will bail me out. For example, we had a community forum in St. Albans, and we have many parents who said, Sure, on prom night, I will sit at City Hall and wait for all the teenagers who are drinking, that are too, in their minds, drunk to drive home, and I will go and get them. But I feel they are sending the wrong message, because that is just saying: We will come and get you if you mess up. And I feel that there are too many times that people get off the hook too easily. And I'm not exactly sure what the answer is, but I just wanted to come today and express my concern about this.

STATEMENT BY NORA CONLON, MEGAN REARDON, BLAIR MARVIN, SHAWN BEIGEN, KATE HENRY AND PHILLIP MOORE REGARDING THE U.N. AND THE U.S.

NORA CONLON. A great deal of how successful the United Nations is depends on the attitudes of its member states. Americans have usually supported full U.S. cooperation with the U.N., but the level of support declined markedly beginning in the early 1970s, and remained relatively low during the 1980s. The U.S.'s stance during that period toward the United Nations was that of a reluctant participant.

The 1990s have witnessed a strong revival of American support for full U.S. cooperation with the United Nations. This is because President Clinton's administration has expressed a great interest in the U.N., more so than its predecessors. The U.N. support that exists now from Americans is roughly equal to the strong support that existed in the 1960s. While American public support for the U.N. may be high, nevertheless the United States Government's opinion of the U.N.'s effectiveness is low.

This chart illustrates U.S. cooperation with the United Nations. The question asked was whether or not poll respondents agreed with the statement: Should the United States cooperate fully with the United Nations? The red line represents the percentage of those who are in support of full cooperation, while the black line represents those who oppose full cooperation with the United Nations. You can see that American support for the United Nations has increased considerably, and yet the U.S. Government has taken a far different stance towards the U.N.

KATE HENRY. The tension is between the U.S. and the U.N. is financial. By a contradiction of terms, the U.S. is both the greatest contributor and debtor of the 185 member countries of the U.N. The United States is responsible for 25 percent of U.N. expenditures, but despite a \$60 billion surplus in our own budget, we are \$1.3 billion behind in our payments to the peacekeeping budget of the U.N.

Legislative efforts have been made to pay up—and, actually, I have a question for you, Congressman, concerning this. On March 26th, the State Department authorization bill approved by voice vote an \$819 million

U.N. debt payment. This has been stalled since 1997, because the House of Representatives tried to include a provision holding that none of the money was to fund any family planning organization that performed abortions. President Clinton vows to veto any bill containing the abortion provision.

I believe that they have lost sight of the humanitarian issues and that the payment of international peacekeeping dues should not be prevented by conflicts within our own government. I was wondering what your position was on this.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS. I will answer that question in a minute. Okay? I am happy to answer that, but let's let everybody make their statement.

BLAIR MARVIN. One of the reasons why the U.S. is withholding a payment of its debt is that our government has developed its own agenda for U.N. reform. The United States emphasis on reform is intended to stabilize the U.N. financially, making the organization more efficient. We wanted it to be more focused on key priorities and more accountable for its members.

Progress has begun in areas of greater budget discipline. The two key requirements in this is the lowering of the U.S.'s assessed share of the U.N. budget from 25 percent to 20 percent over a three-year period, along with the creation of a contested arrears account for debts disputed by the U.S.

One other area of reform is the U.S. commitment to the expansion the U.N. Security Council, which will strengthen its effectiveness and this will enhance representation throughout the world without detracting from its working efficiency. The U.S. wishes to grant permanent seats to Japan and accept three other seats from the developing nations from the regions of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

PHILLIP MOORE. The U.N. is a valuable asset for the U.S. foreign policy. On numerous occasions, the U.N. has given the United States a chance to gain international backing for issues important to American national interests—for instance, the Persian Gulf War. The U.N. Security Council provided for several measures which gave support for a multinational coalition force, which helped regain control of Kuwait from Iraq and also provided President Clinton with the authorization to form a multinational force to help reinstall the democratic government on Haiti.

The peacekeeping missions of the U.N. are also vital to American interests. Often, peacekeeping missions keep regional conflicts from growing into a wider crisis which may involve U.S. military intervention. For instance, on the island of Cyprus. The two NATO nations of Greece and Turkey have a conflict over the island of Cyprus. However, U.N. forces have kept the issue from growing into open conflict. And since the two nations are members of NATO, that could be a serious problem for the alliance. Humanitarian aid of the U.N. also benefits America as well, because it is in no one's interest to allow members of other countries to go on suffering.

By not paying our dues to the U.N., we are weakening our ability to play a larger role in the international community and ultimately hurt our own national interest and well-being.

MEGAN REARDON. We would like to leave you with a few suggestions on the U.N., because it is a tough topic. We propose you support the U.N. agencies on human rights and economic and social development; and pay our dues, which is an important one; support expansion of the Security Council with Germany and Japan; and support and gain support for collective peacekeeping.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS. Thank you. Excellent.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. DAVID MCINTOSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4194) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes:

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, today, the House needs to retain the legislative restriction on new regulations in the VA-HUD bill to ensure that the Clinton-Gore Administration does not implement the Kyoto Protocol through the backdoor prior to Senate ratification of the treaty.

Retaining this language will ensure that the Administration will not circumvent through regulation the Senate's constitutional responsibility of advice and consent with respect to treaties.

In Kyoto, Vice President Al Gore already ignored the U.S. Senate's bi-partisan, unanimous resolution (the 95-0 Byrd-Hagel resolution) not to negotiate a treaty which either exempts developing countries or hurts the American economy.

In a series of hearings entitled "The Kyoto Protocol: Is the Clinton-Gore Administration Selling Out Americans?," my Subcommittee has heard from democratic and Republican State and local elected officials, businesses, labor, and consumers, that the Kyoto Protocol is a bad deal for America and will have dire consequences on Americans, including:

Huge job losses, up to 1.5 million according to the AFL-CIO and more according to other studies; Cecil Roberts, the President of the United Mine Workers, testified that the Administration should not proceed prior to Senate ratification; Ande Abbot representing the Boilermakers union, part of the AFL-CIO, agreed—no implementation prior to ratification.

Huge increase in the cost of living for American families (\$2700 more per household for energy and other products);

Greatly diminished U.S. trade competitiveness;

Recently, a union machinist from my district testified before my Subcommittee that the Kyoto Protocol "is bad news for the American worker" and "we want jobs, not assistance."

Al Gore's Kyoto Protocol is a fundamentally flawed treaty, with unrealistic targets and timetables.

It commits the U.S. to reduce greenhouse gas emission by 7% below 1990 levels within the 2008-2012 period.

In real terms, this treaty mandates an unprecedented 41% reduction of fossil fuels use from business-as-usual.

Al Gore's Kyoto Protocol is unfair and unworkable.

It does not allow developing countries (like China, India, and Brazil), which will be emitting a majority of the world's greenhouse gas